

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011

Applicant City of Palmdale	Amount Requested	\$6,500,000
-----------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------

Proposal Title Upper Amargosa Creek Flood Control, Recharge, and Habitat Restoration Project	Total Proposal Cost	\$13,483,322
---	----------------------------	--------------

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

The objective of the project is to channelize a portion of the Amargosa Creek, construct eight recharge basins, and expand habitat protection and recreational space to prevent flood damages, provide a reliable water supply to meet the Antelope Valley Region's future water demand, and provide habitat protection and recreational public space.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	15/15	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	9/12
Budget	3/5	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	6/12
Schedule	1/5	Program Preferences	6/10
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	4/5		
Total Score (max. possible = 64)			44

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Work Plan

The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. Task submittals are identified. The Work Plan discusses the goals and objectives of the Project and how they are consistent with the adopted IRWM Plan. Regional and project maps are provided as well as a list of permits and their status including California Environmental Quality Act compliance. Tasks collectively implement the Project. Plans and specifications are consistent with the design tasks presented in the Work Plan. Several reports have been completed regarding this project that support the feasibility of the Project. The Work Plan demonstrates the project could function on a standalone basis. The Project proposes to provide flood protection by confining Amargosa Creek stormwater flows within channel berms that prevent erosion damage to nearby utilities, local streets, and eliminating a public safety hazard.

Budget

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The tasks in the Budget don't completely coincide with the tasks of the Work Plan. For example, Task 7 of the Work Plan is "Permitting" while Task 7 of the Budget is "Construction Contracting." Additionally, lump sums totals are included for some of the budgeted items. For example, Table 4-4 "Land Purchase/Easement Budget" has a lump sum of \$450,000 listed for the "Waiver of City Impact Fees." It is unclear why if the fee is waived there is still a charge amounting to more than the land purchase cost. Also, Task 8 of the Budget, "Construction," lists several lump sums. Task 1, Project Administration, and Task 3, Reporting, have been listed as one amount under Task 1, so it is unclear what amounts of the total \$241,967 are attributed to each task.

Schedule

The scheduled date of "Complete Contractor Award and Begin Construction" is January 10, 2013, which is more than 12 months from the anticipated contract award date of October 1, 2011.

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. Output Indicators effectively track output. However, some Outcome Indicators don't provide enough information to verify that they will effectively track outcome. For example, Project Goal 5 "Improve water quality" has the Outcome Indicator of "Quantification of water recharge at the site." It is understood that additional water recharge will assist in preventing arsenic from moving into the aquifer, but quantifying water recharge doesn't directly relate to its associated goal. A more direct Outcome Indicator that would accurately illustrate an improvement of water quality would involve quantifying the quality of water in the aquifer.

Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) and Water Supply Benefits

High levels of FDR and water supply benefits can be realized through this proposal; however, the quality of the analysis was partially lacking and/or supporting documentation was partially unsubstantiated. In particular, some of the inundation data is suspect, no expected annual damage is calculated, and a water supply of 25,000 acre feet (AF) by 2015 is suspect. Total net present value (NPV) of costs is \$14.464 million. FDR claimed benefits are \$0.618 million consisting of \$0.299 of erosion benefits and \$0.319 million of street flooding benefits. The planning horizon analysis shows erosion damages avoided in 2011, 2021, 2031, etc rather than an expected value each year. No inundation maps are provided. Water supply claimed benefits are \$15.725 million. The analysis assumes that an average of 2,500 AF can be stored annually, and 25,000 AF is taken from storage every 10 years beginning in 2015. This implies that 25,000 AF can be stored from the time the project is complete through 2014. Again, the analysis should have used an expected value.

Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits

Average levels of water quality and other benefits can be realized through this proposal; however, the quality of the analysis is partially lacking and/or supporting documentation is partially unsubstantiated. No monetized water quality and other benefits are claimed. Qualitative benefits are reduced migration of arsenic from the lower to the upper aquifer, creation, protection and enhancement of 25 acres of native habitat, recreation and public access, reduced stress on the bay-delta, aid in resolving water conflicts, improved salt management, and public safety.

Program Preferences

The Proposal includes a project that implements the following Program Preferences: Include Regional Projects or Programs, Effectively Integrate Water Management with Land Use Planning, Drought Preparedness, Expand Environmental Stewardship, Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently, and Protect Surface Water and Ground Quality. However, the Proposal demonstrates a limited degree of certainty that the Program Preferences claimed can be achieved, and lacks thorough documentation for the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preferences to be implemented.